

**WSDOT/ACEC-WA  
Project Delivery Team  
September 9, 2005  
Lacey, Washington**

**Attendees**

Ken Smith – Team Co-Chair  
Duncan Findlay – Team Co-Chair  
Kirk Berg  
Andrea Billingsley  
Doyle Dilley (absent)  
Richard (Rick) Door  
Russ East (absent)  
Mary Holland  
Mike Horton  
Ron Landon  
Mike Mariano (absent)  
Keith Metcalf  
Amir Rasaie  
Lisa Reid  
Rick Smith  
John Villager  
Karl Winterstein

**Guest**

Jon Bauer, WSDOT CAE Office

**Review Meeting Agenda**

The next meeting may need to be delayed until October 14, 2005. Mary Holland of HNTB will be hosting.

Ken passed out copies of the updated group tracking sheet.

**New CAE Environment InRoads Communication**

**Jon Bauer**

WSDOT has made the decision to move to InRoads. Jon attended the meeting to find out the best way to communicate where this process is heading to consultants.

- ACEC website
- IMPACT Newsletter that is distributed every couple of months
- WSDOT Internet

It was suggested that Jon have a member of his staff provide an article to put in the IMPACT Newsletter and on the ACEC website.

Issues that have been identified include buying the software and training.

**Action Item:** *Jon Bauer will provide an article that will go into the ACEC IMPACT newsletter and include link information. This will also contain a contact name and number for consultants to use.*

*Jon will try to provide a draft to this group by October 3, for review at the October meeting.*

### **Draft Recommendation on Co-Location**

This recommendation refers to the co-locating that is occurring now and some training that is available. What is the best way to take advantage of that co-locating and training?

**Action Item:** *Delay this subject until the October meeting. Have representation from the I-405 Office. Mary Holland and John Villager will talk to people who may be willing to represent the I-405 Project Office. Karl Winterstein will contact Doyle Dilley.*

### **Reopening On-Call Registers**

#### **Rick Smith**

Rick Smith explained that reopening on-call registers has proven to be a tough issue. There has been a major effort on WSDOT's part to open on-call registers for specialty consultants, but it has yet to be successful. There is an agreement with ACEC that we will only do this once a year. Rick Smith would like to find out how much interest there is from consulting firms in doing this. Project specific on-call registers may be more attractive to some consulting firms. Some of the WSDOT regions have not needed anything other than on-call consultants until recently. UCO has both on-call agreements and a statewide on-call agreement.

**Action Item:** *Rick Smith will get together with Don Nelson and Mike Rice before the October meeting to discuss how to supplement workforce in different areas (mainly the smaller regions).*

### **Change Recommendation #6**

#### **Ken Smith**

Original recommendation: Revise Design Manual Chapter 330.08 to require concurrence with the 13 design controlling criteria prior to endorsing the work plan for project development.

Revised recommendation: Revise the Design Decision Summary to include the 13 controlling design criteria for all alignments affected by the project.

**Action Item:** *Ken will send Change Recommendation #6 out to the stakeholders for statewide review. Ken may also add this to the PDE Conference Call agenda.*

## **Draft Recommendations for Agreements**

### **Keith Metcalf**

Original Recommendation: Recommend that a team of experts in the area of various agreements be established to review the current requirements and make recommendations as the where streamlining opportunities exist.

Ken Smith explained that this group is the wrong team to work out the details, but it is the right team to make the recommendation.

**Action Item:** *Ken Smith will take the Agreements recommendation to Don Nelson for signature and it will then be passed to Tom Swafford.*

## **Review Process/Review Principles**

### **John Villager**

John Villager handed out a draft list of issues this group developed at the last meeting. The concerns are how to keep the review process moving forward. Is there any agency-wide knowledge on how timely design steps are being completed?

The interesting aspect of this discussion is how we measure success. The focus has always been on the Ad date. If a project meets the Ad date, it's a successful achievement. But once the Ad date is met, the time to Award can be extended at will. Is this wrong? Should this be changed? You don't want to lose the Ad date as a milestone, but should it be the only measurement of success?

**Action Item:** *Andrea Billingsley will send the link to the QA/QC Plan Activity Guide. The team is to review the QA/QC Plan Activity Guide.*

*Identify the Problems:*

- *Expectations*
- *Input*
- *Output*

## **Project Delivery Legal Requirements**

### **Rick Smith**

Delayed until the October meeting.

**Action Item:** *After you review the Project Delivery Legal Requirements document that was sent out, please forward your questions to Rick Smith. Look at areas that have caused frustration.*

**Assignments/Deliverables for Next Meeting**

The next meeting is tentatively set for October 14, 2005, at HNTB.

- Review the new CAE environment - InRoads
- Draft recommendation on co-locations
- Project Delivery legal requirements
- Update on implementation of recommendations
- Jon Bauer will discuss InRoads
- Jon Bauer/George Spencer: Scanning right of way plans to make them electronically accessible